

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

March 13, 2006 LB 87

split infinitives, and the teacher could read it and still understand what we're trying to say. Is that correct?

SENATOR BYARS: My instructor was really bad on split infinitives.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So when that would show up on a paper, a teacher...usually they'd use a red pencil, mark it, and write in what the correct way is for expressing what we were supposed to be trying to say. Do you agree?

SENATOR BYARS: Absolutely.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Should those things that we learn in school follow us and play a part in how we express ourselves, or especially when we write laws?

SENATOR BYARS: Yes. Everything that we learn is positive within our school experience, our education experience, should follow us.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So even though some of my colleagues are not swift enough or attentive enough or professional enough in their approach to understand why we ought to properly frame legislation, can you understand that there are some people who take law writing very seriously?

SENATOR BYARS: Oh, yes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you, Senator Byars. I'm not going to push this issue at this point, because the bill is on Final Reading. Leaving it the way it's written is not going to, in any way, affect the understanding. But I'll say here what I said when I was talking to Senator Kremer. We could say "ain't" in legislation if we want to. We could say "ain't got no" if we chose to. We could write "youse guys and youse gals" if we want to. So before some people think that what I do is of no consequence, they need to understand that I have a higher standard than they have, that my concept of professionalism in drafting legislation is much higher than theirs. And I will continue to do as I think I ought to do. But in some instances,